



Rick Scott <rick.scott@lacity.org>

Venice Beach database: resubmission

5 messages

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>

Mon, Apr 6, 2015 at 4:26 PM

To: Dennis Rader <Dennis.Rader@lacity.org>, Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>

Cc: Rick Scott <Rick.Scott@lacity.org>

Attached please find the revised Venice database in which we hope we have addressed all your comments and questions. The notes columns may help answer many questions, but we are also available to answer them.

Key changes I would note:

- We discovered that a few state-owned parcels and one tiny City parcel up near the boundary with the City of Santa Monica were missing from the prior database. We have added these. Recorded data for these parcels is a bit funky but we used the underlying map to determine ownership. It might stem from the fact that the parcels were in the City of SM until 1965. <http://maps.assessor.lacounty.gov/Geocortex/Essentials/REST/sites/PAIS/VirtualDirectory/AssessorMaps/ViewMap.html?val=4288-029>

- Metro, LAUSD and two city-owned parcels were missing building data. This has been added using certificate of occupancy and/or building permit data except for LAUSD, which we estimated due to no Assessor or LADBS data. We have attempted to obtain self-reported information from LAUSD without success so far. There is a tab in the dbase showing how we calculated the LAUSD estimate.

- For the City and state-owned parcels on the west side of Ocean Front Walk, we removed any portion of of the LOT that was attributable to sand. Per discussions with Miranda with which I believe you are aware, it has been agreed that the BID will service everything that is not sand, including any improved area (any paved areas or walkways and the grassy knoll/landscaped areas along the Boardwalk.) The reductions were done using the percentages we previously submitted for Clerk's review (we determined the % of each lot attributable to sand and reduced the lot by that %. The reductions ranged from 0% to 67% and are calculated in the Gov't columns for Building, Frontage and Lot.)

- We removed the portion of the assessment (7%) attributable to the budget category "district identity and special projects" for a number of public parcels that will not benefit from these programs. You will see more detail on this on the public parcels tab (there is a column identifying which parcels have the 7% reduction.) These reflect discussions with Miranda this year on this subject in reference to different public uses and whether or not they benefit from the marketing and promotion of the District; I am available to answer any questions you might have. The 7% reductions are calculated in the Gov't columns for Building, Frontage and Lot for affected parcels.

- Zone 1 and Zone 2 were combined into a single tab with SUMIFs for district totals.

- Tabs added for MDP tables. One is incomplete pending ER (requires Ed's general benefit calculation.)

- Lots of cleanup!

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
DEVINE STRATEGIES
621 S. Spring St., PH1202
Los Angeles, CA 90014
310.430.5121
tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES

Political - Legislative - Economic Development - Planning & Entitlements - Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts

2015.04.06 Venice revised - submitted to City.xlsx
232K

Dennis Rader <dennis.rader@lacity.org>

Wed, Apr 8, 2015 at 12:29 PM

To: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>

Cc: Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>, Rick Scott <Rick.Scott@lacity.org>

Tara, I was looking over the recent data that you submitted and I couldn't find some parcels that I thought would be in there.

Please refer to my email sent on Dec 31, 2014, where I listed various parcels that appeared to be in the boundaries but were not in the data. In a subsequent email you wrote that you added all of the parcels that I had listed, and that they were in bold print in that attached spreadsheet. I could find some, but not all of the parcels in that spreadsheet dated 2015.01.06

On this latest spreadsheet, I couldn't find any of the parcels that I had listed, nor could I find an explanation for exclusion in any of the emails that I was cc'd on. Am I missing some change that I'm not aware of? These are the parcels that are missing:

4286009013 & 026

4286009100 thru 134

4286012-all except 016 are not included in data

4286029017

4286030003 & 022

Let me know if there were updates that I'm missing.

On Mon, Apr 6, 2015 at 4:26 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

Attached please find the revised Venice database in which we hope we have addressed all your comments and questions. The notes columns may help answer many questions, but we are also available to answer them.

Key changes I would note:

- We discovered that a few state-owned parcels and one tiny City parcel up near the boundary with the City of Santa Monica were missing from the prior database. We have added these. Recorded data for these parcels is a bit funky but we used the underlying map to determine ownership. It might stem from the fact that the parcels were in the City of SM until 1965. <http://maps.assessor.lacounty.gov/Geocortex/Essentials/REST/sites/PAIS/VirtualDirectory/AssessorMaps/ViewMap.html?val=4288-029>

- Metro, LAUSD and two city-owned parcels were missing building data. This has been added using certificate of occupancy and/or building permit data except for LAUSD, which we estimated due to no Assessor or LADBS data. We have attempted to obtain self-reported information from LAUSD without success so far. There is a tab in the dbase showing how we calculated the LAUSD estimate.

- For the City and state-owned parcels on the west side of Ocean Front Walk, we removed any portion of of the LOT that was attributable to sand. Per discussions with Miranda with which I believe you are aware, it has been agreed that the BID will service everything that is not sand, including any improved area (any paved areas or walkways and the grassy knoll/landscaped areas along the Boardwalk.) The reductions were done using the percentages we previously submitted for Clerk's review (we determined the % of each lot attributable to sand and reduced the lot by that %. The reductions ranged from 0% to 67% and are calculated in the Gov't columns for Building, Frontage and Lot.)

- We removed the portion of the assessment (7%) attributable to the budget category "district identity and special projects" for a number of public parcels that will not benefit from these programs. You will see more detail on this on the public parcels tab (there is a column identifying which parcels have the 7% reduction.) These reflect discussions with Miranda this year on this subject in reference to different public uses and whether or not they benefit from the marketing and promotion of the District; I am available to answer any questions you might have. The 7% reductions are calculated in the Gov't columns for Building, Frontage and Lot for affected parcels.

- Zone 1 and Zone 2 were combined into a single tab with SUMIFs for district totals.

- Tabs added for MDP tables. One is incomplete pending ER (requires Ed's general benefit calculation.)

- Lots of cleanup!

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
DEVINE STRATEGIES
621 S. Spring St., PH1202
Los Angeles, CA 90014
310.430.5121
tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES

Political - Legislative - Economic Development - Planning & Entitlements - Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts

-

Dennis Rader
Technical Research Supervisor
Los Angeles City Clerk, NBID Division
213-978-1120

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>
To: Dennis Rader <dennis.rader@lacity.org>
Cc: Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>, Rick Scott <Rick.Scott@lacity.org>

Wed, Apr 8, 2015 at 1:04 PM

I believe you are correct that we are missing these parcels. Allow us to investigate further and (most likely) restore them. I am not sure how or why they were not included or were inadvertently deleted.

Thank you for catching this!

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
DEVINE STRATEGIES
621 S. Spring St., PH1202
Los Angeles, CA 90014
310.430.5121
tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES

Political - Legislative - Economic Development - Planning & Entitlements - Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts

On Wed, Apr 8, 2015 at 12:29 PM, Dennis Rader <dennis.rader@lacity.org> wrote:

Tara, I was looking over the recent data that you submitted and I couldn't find some parcels that I thought would be in there.

Please refer to my email sent on Dec 31, 2014, where I listed various parcels that appeared to be in the boundaries but were not in the data. In a subsequent email you wrote that you added all of the parcels that I had listed, and that they were in bold print in that attached spreadsheet. I could find some, but not all of the parcels in that spreadsheet dated 2015.01.06

On this latest spreadsheet, I couldn't find any of the parcels that I had listed, nor could I find an explanation for exclusion in any of the emails that I was cc'd on. Am I missing some change that I'm not aware of? These are the parcels that are missing:

4286009013 & 026
4286009100 thru 134
4286012-all except 016 are not included in data
4286029017

4286030003 & 022

Let me know if there were updates that I'm missing.

On Mon, Apr 6, 2015 at 4:26 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

Attached please find the revised Venice database in which we hope we have addressed all your comments and questions. The notes columns may help answer many questions, but we are also available to answer them.

Key changes I would note:

- We discovered that a few state-owned parcels and one tiny City parcel up near the boundary with the City of Santa Monica were missing from the prior database. We have added these. Recorded data for these parcels is a bit funky but we used the underlying map to determine ownership. It might stem from the fact that the parcels were in the City of SM until 1965. <http://maps.assessor.lacounty.gov/Geocortex/Essentials/REST/sites/PAIS/VirtualDirectory/AssessorMaps/ViewMap.html?val=4288-029>
- Metro, LAUSD and two city-owned parcels were missing building data. This has been added using certificate of occupancy and/or building permit data except for LAUSD, which we estimated due to no Assessor or LADBS data. We have attempted to obtain self-reported information from LAUSD without success so far. There is a tab in the dbase showing how we calculated the LAUSD estimate.
- For the City and state-owned parcels on the west side of Ocean Front Walk, we removed any portion of of the LOT that was attributable to sand. Per discussions with Miranda with which I believe you are aware, it has been agreed that the BID will service everything that is not sand, including any improved area (any paved areas or walkways and the grassy knoll/landscaped areas along the Boardwalk.) The reductions were done using the percentages we previously submitted for Clerk's review (we determined the % of each lot attributable to sand and reduced the lot by that %. The reductions ranged from 0% to 67% and are calculated in the Gov't columns for Building, Frontage and Lot.)
- We removed the portion of the assessment (7%) attributable to the budget category "district identity and special projects" for a number of public parcels that will not benefit from these programs. You will see more detail on this on the public parcels tab (there is a column identifying which parcels have the 7% reduction.) These reflect discussions with Miranda this year on this subject in reference to different public uses and whether or not they benefit from the marketing and promotion of the District; I am available to answer any questions you might have. The 7% reductions are calculated in the Gov't columns for Building, Frontage and Lot for affected parcels.
- Zone 1 and Zone 2 were combined into a single tab with SUMIFs for district totals.
- Tabs added for MDP tables. One is incomplete pending ER (requires Ed's general benefit calculation.)
- Lots of cleanup!

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
DEVINE STRATEGIES
621 S. Spring St., PH1202
Los Angeles, CA 90014
310.430.5121
tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES

Political - Legislative - Economic Development - Planning & Entitlements - Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts

--

Dennis Rader
Technical Research Supervisor
Los Angeles City Clerk, NBID Division
213-978-1120

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>
To: Dennis Rader <dennis.rader@lacity.org>
Cc: Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>, Rick Scott <Rick.Scott@lacity.org>

Fri, Apr 10, 2015 at 11:10 AM

Somewhere amidst the dbase versions, the parcels you mentioned were accidentally deleted. We did have them in earlier versions and have restored them.

4286029017, 4286030003 & 022 are the last 3 APNs now listed under Zone 1, and the others are the last 44 APNs listed under Zone 2. The Zone 2 parcels are mostly newer condos, and we still lack ownership data for them (if we don't get it prior to petition, we will mail petitions to the site addresses.)

Again - thank you for catching this. Please let me know if you find anything else!

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
DEVINE STRATEGIES
621 S. Spring St., PH1202
Los Angeles, CA 90014
310.430.5121
tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES

Political - Legislative - Economic Development - Planning & Entitlements - Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts

On Wed, Apr 8, 2015 at 1:04 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

I believe you are correct that we are missing these parcels. Allow us to investigate further and (most likely) restore them. I am not sure how or why they were not included or were inadvertently deleted.

Thank you for catching this!

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
DEVINE STRATEGIES
621 S. Spring St., PH1202
Los Angeles, CA 90014
310.430.5121
tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES

Political - Legislative - Economic Development - Planning & Entitlements - Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts

On Wed, Apr 8, 2015 at 12:29 PM, Dennis Rader <dennis.rader@lacity.org> wrote:

Tara, I was looking over the recent data that you submitted and I couldn't find some parcels that I thought would be in there.

Please refer to my email sent on Dec 31, 2014, where I listed various parcels that appeared to be in the boundaries but were not in the data. In a subsequent email you wrote that you added all of the parcels that I had listed, and that they were in bold print in that attached spreadsheet. I could find some, but not all of the parcels in that spreadsheet dated 2015.01.06

On this latest spreadsheet, I couldn't find any of the parcels that I had listed, nor could I find an explanation for exclusion in any of the emails that I was cc'd on. Am I missing some change that I'm not aware of? These are the parcels that are missing:

4286009013 & 026
4286009100 thru 134
4286012-all except 016 are not included in data
4286029017

4286030003 & 022

Let me know if there were updates that I'm missing.

On Mon, Apr 6, 2015 at 4:26 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

Attached please find the revised Venice database in which we hope we have addressed all your comments and questions. The notes columns may help answer many questions, but we are also available to answer them.

Key changes I would note:

- We discovered that a few state-owned parcels and one tiny City parcel up near the boundary with the City of Santa Monica were missing from the prior database. We have added these. Recorded data for these parcels is a bit funky but we used the underlying map to determine ownership. It might stem from the fact that the parcels were in the City of SM until 1965. <http://maps.assessor.lacounty.gov/Geocortex/Essentials/REST/sites/PAIS/VirtualDirectory/AssessorMaps/ViewMap.html?val=4288-029>

- Metro, LAUSD and two city-owned parcels were missing building data. This has been added using certificate of occupancy and/or building permit data except for LAUSD, which we estimated due to no Assessor or LADBS data. We have attempted to obtain self-reported information from LAUSD without success so far. There is a tab in the dbase showing how we calculated the LAUSD estimate.

- For the City and state-owned parcels on the west side of Ocean Front Walk, we removed any portion of the LOT that was attributable to sand. Per discussions with Miranda with which I believe you are aware, it has been agreed that the BID will service everything that is not sand, including any improved area (any paved areas or walkways and the grassy knoll/landscaped areas along the Boardwalk.) The reductions were done using the percentages we previously submitted for Clerk's review (we determined the % of each lot attributable to sand and reduced the lot by that %. The reductions ranged from 0% to 67% and are calculated in the Gov't columns for Building, Frontage and Lot.)

- We removed the portion of the assessment (7%) attributable to the budget category "district identity and special projects" for a number of public parcels that will not benefit from these programs. You will see more detail on this on the public parcels tab (there is a column identifying which parcels have the 7% reduction.) These reflect discussions with Miranda this year on this subject in reference to different public uses and whether or not they benefit from the marketing and promotion of the District; I am available to answer any questions you might have. The 7% reductions are calculated in the Gov't columns for Building, Frontage and Lot for affected parcels.

- Zone 1 and Zone 2 were combined into a single tab with SUMIFs for district totals.

- Tabs added for MDP tables. One is incomplete pending ER (requires Ed's general benefit calculation.)

- Lots of cleanup!

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
DEVINE STRATEGIES
621 S. Spring St., PH1202
Los Angeles, CA 90014
310.430.5121
tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES

Political - Legislative - Economic Development - Planning & Entitlements - Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts

--

Dennis Rader
Technical Research Supervisor
Los Angeles City Clerk, NBID Division
213-978-1120



2015.04.10 Venice revised - submitted to City.xlsx
250K

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>

To: Dennis Rader <dennis.rader@lacity.org>

Cc: Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>, Rick Scott <Rick.Scott@lacity.org>

Fri, Apr 10, 2015 at 11:56 AM

After sending, I caught a minor miss on formatting/blank fields. This is the current version (there are no numerical changes whatsoever to prior document, just the addition of "NONE" to a couple of site address fields that were blank (no data available) and one cosmetic change. I caught these when I was plugging the parcel roll into the MDP.

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
DEVINE STRATEGIES
621 S. Spring St., PH1202
Los Angeles, CA 90014
310.430.5121
tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES

Political - Legislative - Economic Development - Planning & Entitlements - Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts

On Fri, Apr 10, 2015 at 11:10 AM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

Somewhere amidst the dbase versions, the parcels you mentioned were accidentally deleted. We did have them in earlier versions and have restored them.

4286029017, 4286030003 & 022 are the last 3 APNs now listed under Zone 1, and the others are the last 44 APNs listed under Zone 2. The Zone 2 parcels are mostly newer condos, and we still lack ownership data for them (if we don't get it prior to petition, we will mail petitions to the site addresses.)

Again - thank you for catching this. Please let me know if you find anything else!

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
DEVINE STRATEGIES
621 S. Spring St., PH1202
Los Angeles, CA 90014
310.430.5121
tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES

Political - Legislative - Economic Development - Planning & Entitlements - Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts

On Wed, Apr 8, 2015 at 1:04 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

I believe you are correct that we are missing these parcels. Allow us to investigate further and (most likely) restore them. I am not sure how or why they were not included or were inadvertently deleted.

Thank you for catching this!

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
DEVINE STRATEGIES
621 S. Spring St., PH1202
Los Angeles, CA 90014
310.430.5121
tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES

Political - Legislative - Economic Development - Planning & Entitlements - Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts

On Wed, Apr 8, 2015 at 12:29 PM, Dennis Rader <dennis.rader@lacity.org> wrote:

Tara, I was looking over the recent data that you submitted and I couldn't find some parcels that I thought would be in there.

Please refer to my email sent on Dec 31, 2014, where I listed various parcels that appeared to be in the boundaries but were not in the data. In a subsequent email you wrote that you added all of the parcels that I had listed, and that they were in bold print in that attached spreadsheet. I could find some, but not all of the parcels in that spreadsheet dated 2015.01.06

On this latest spreadsheet, I couldn't find any of the parcels that I had listed, nor could I find an explanation for exclusion in any of the emails that I was cc'd on. Am I missing some change that I'm not aware of? These are the parcels that are missing:

4286009013 & 026
 4286009100 thru 134
 4286012-all except 016 are not included in data
 4286029017
 4286030003 & 022

Let me know if there were updates that I'm missing.

On Mon, Apr 6, 2015 at 4:26 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

Attached please find the revised Venice database in which we hope we have addressed all your comments and questions. The notes columns may help answer many questions, but we are also available to answer them.

Key changes I would note:

- We discovered that a few state-owned parcels and one tiny City parcel up near the boundary with the City of Santa Monica were missing from the prior database. We have added these. Recorded data for these parcels is a bit funky but we used the underlying map to determine ownership. It might stem from the fact that the parcels were in the City of SM until 1965. <http://maps.assessor.lacounty.gov/Geocortex/Essentials/REST/sites/PAIS/VirtualDirectory/AssessorMaps/ViewMap.html?val=4288-029>
- Metro, LAUSD and two city-owned parcels were missing building data. This has been added using certificate of occupancy and/or building permit data except for LAUSD, which we estimated due to no Assessor or LADBS data. We have attempted to obtain self-reported information from LAUSD without success so far. There is a tab in the dbase showing how we calculated the LAUSD estimate.
- For the City and state-owned parcels on the west side of Ocean Front Walk, we removed any portion of the LOT that was attributable to sand. Per discussions with Miranda with which I believe you are aware, it has been agreed that the BID will service everything that is not sand, including any improved area (any paved areas or walkways and the grassy knoll/landscaped areas along the Boardwalk.) The reductions were done using the percentages we previously submitted for Clerk's review (we determined the % of each lot attributable to sand and reduced the lot by that %. The reductions ranged from 0% to 67% and are calculated in the Gov't columns for Building, Frontage and Lot.)
- We removed the portion of the assessment (7%) attributable to the budget category "district identity and special projects" for a number of public parcels that will not benefit from these programs. You will see more detail on this on the public parcels tab (there is a column identifying which parcels have the 7% reduction.) These reflect discussions with Miranda this year on this subject in reference to different public uses and whether or not they benefit from the marketing and promotion of the District; I am available to answer any questions you might have. The 7% reductions are calculated in the Gov't columns for Building, Frontage and Lot for affected parcels.
- Zone 1 and Zone 2 were combined into a single tab with SUMIFs for district totals.
- Tabs added for MDP tables. One is incomplete pending ER (requires Ed's general benefit calculation.)

- Lots of cleanup!

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
DEVINE STRATEGIES
621 S. Spring St., PH1202
Los Angeles, CA 90014
[310.430.5121](tel:310.430.5121)
tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES

Political - Legislative - Economic Development - Planning & Entitlements - Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts

--

Dennis Rader
Technical Research Supervisor
Los Angeles City Clerk, NBID Division
[213-978-1120](tel:213-978-1120)



2015.04.10 Venice revised - submitted to City.xlsx
250K

